## For the Northern District of California

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1									
2									
3									
4									
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT								
6	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA								
7									
8	ERIC ARDOIN,	No. C-11-5564 EMC (pr)							
9	Petitioner,	ODDED OD AMEINO DECITIONEDS							
10	v.	ORDER GRANTING PETITIONER'S MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE							
11	MIKE McDONALD,	A NOTICE OF APPEAL; AND CONSTRUING NOTICE OF APPEAL AS TIMELY FILED							
12	Respondent.								
13		/ (Docket Nos. 23-24)							

This is a closed federal habeas corpus action. The habeas petition was denied and judgment was entered in favor of Respondent on February 13, 2013. Petitioner has filed (Docket No. 23) a notice of appeal ("NOA"), and a motion for an extension of time to file the NOA. (Docket No. 24.)

Petitioner's motion for an extension of time is **GRANTED**. An appeal of right may be taken only by filing a valid NOA in the district court within the time allowed by Fed. R. App. P. ("FRAP") 4. See FRAP 3(a)(1). The NOA must be filed within 30 days after judgment is entered. See FRAP 4(a)(1). Under this rule, Petitioner should have filed his NOA no later than March 15, 2013. His NOA was filed roughly two weeks after that, on April 1, 2013. (Though stamped as received on April 8th, for purposes of the present motion the Court assumes that Petitioner put the motion in the prison mail the day he signed it and will use that as the filing date under the prisoner mailbox rule. See generally Houston v. Lack, 487 U.S. 266, 276 (1988).)

Relief from the deadline for filing an NOA may be obtained by a motion in the district court under FRAP 4(a)(5) (motion for an extension of time) or 4(a)(6) (motion to reopen time to file

appeal).	FRAP 4(a)(5)	allows a motion	for an ext	ension of	of time	if the party	requests i	it within	thirty
days of t	he expiration of	of the time to file	the notice	e and she	ows an	excusable r	neglect or	good car	use.

Here, that means that under FRAP 4(a)(5), Petitioner must have requested an extension of time within 30 days after March 15, 2013, viz., on or before April 14, 2013. Petitioner's motion was signed on April 1, 2013, and therefore is timely filed within the meaning of FRAP 4(a)(5). The Court also finds that Petitioner has shown good cause.

The extension having been granted, the Court construes the already-filed NOA (Docket No. 23) as timely filed. The Clerk of the Court shall amend the docket to reflect this conclusion and shall process Petitioner's appeal.

This order disposes of Docket No. 24.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 6, 2013

EDWARD M. CHEN United States District Judge